

members and Mr. Phalen who know what is in it, except Mr. Wright's lawyer, and I think that that report and the backup documents have to be published.

That was the then-Congressman NEWT GINGRICH.

I cannot imagine going to the country, tell them we have got a \$1.6 million report, and by the way there is nothing in it, but you cannot see it.

This is exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is NEWT GINGRICH all over again.

Ms. DELAURO. Clearly that report is going to have to be published. That is right. The now-Speaker was right when he spoke in 1989. That report, it is a report by any other name is a report, ought to be published and the Members of this House ought to know what is in it. More importantly, the American public ought to know what is in it.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. Good or bad, whatever. The public is entitled to know.

Mr. KLINK. If the gentleman will yield, our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida, PORTER GOSS, was on the floor a few moments ago, and he talked about the fact that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct's investigation in the system was broken, and I would suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let us fix it in a bipartisan manner. Let us not make a difference in this House of Representatives whether the Speaker is a Democrat or a Republican, he would be treated differently. I think we need to send some sunshine on this House to make those shadows and those clouds go away.

ANSWER OUR QUESTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, you know there is something going on here that I simply do not understand. A couple weeks ago when the President took the action that he took to counteract the action of Saddam Hussein and Iraq, I came out immediately in strong support of the action that the President took. I think the President did the right thing. There is not time in an emergency situation like that for the President to come to Congress and say, "Hey, this is going on, this is what I want to do, can I do it, should I do it?" That is his decision to make. He made that decision; the American people fully support that.

But now we are 2 weeks after the fact. We are 2 weeks into a crisis situation in the Middle Eastern part of this world, a very dangerous part of the world and a part of the world in which we already had sacrifices back 3 or 4 years ago. It is a part of the world that we have got to keep our pulse on, and what we are into now is the President

of the United States again sending our young men and women into harm's way without coming to the Congress and saying after this 2-week period, "Ladies and gentleman of the Congress, this is what is going on, I need you to know this, and I need your input into this."

As I go home this weekend, I have 3 military bases in my district, I am going to be asked by men and women, not only military men and women, but civilian men and women, "Tell me about what is going on in Iraq."

I am going to say, "Hey, you pick up the Atlanta Journal, you pick up the Macon telegraph, you will find out what's going on, and you'll know just as much as I know."

There is something basically wrong about that.

The chairman of a very powerful subcommittee on the Committee on National Security got up a minute ago and said that he knows nothing about this. He is the gentleman that is responsible for the research and development of the weapons that are being sent to Iraq today. He has no idea whether what he has been working on for the last several years by being a member of the Committee on National Security is the right thing to do. He knows nothing, nobody in this Congress knows anything about what is going on.

I do not think we are asking a whole lot of the President to say, "Mr. President, please come to us and just tell us what's going on. Why are you sending our men and women into harm's way? What should we tell our constituents out there as to why we are supporting you?" And it is a very crucial question on a very crucial issue that I simply do not understand why we are not being advised on, and I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I commend him for his leadership on armed services issues. He has been one of our brightest stars on the committee this year, and we appreciate that.

The issue here, Mr. Speaker, is we supported I publicly supported, President Clinton when he said we were going to send our troops to take action because of the situation with the Kurds. But then, Mr. Speaker, we heard that the first strikes were not successful, that some of the cruise missiles were off by as much as 500 miles. We were not given a specific briefing on that. I sat through the limited briefing that occurred last week, but then a second wave of attacks occurred, and we were told that was a mop-up operation.

By now, day by day, hour by hour, new information comes out, Mr. Speaker, that we have no idea what is going on. It is all from the news media that we are now sending 8 or 10 F-117's over, that we are redeploying some other troops, that we are now putting in Kuwait, that perhaps Saudi Arabia is not

being as supportive as it was, that the whole coalition that was there initially in Desert Storm is falling apart, that we cannot get that kind of support because the action has not taken—we need to have those questions answered because these are our kids that this President is sending into harm's way.

And believe me, Mr. Speaker, if there are casualties over this weekend, we are going to demand to know why we were not consulted, and we are going to demand to know why we did not have compliance with the War Powers Act; why, in fact, we are going beyond the U.N. resolutions where unilaterally it looks like the United States alone is taking up this mission. These are questions that FLOYD SPENCE and RON DELUMS and BEN GILMAN and LEE HAMILTON need to have answered and should have been briefed on.

But, Mr. Speaker, as of today, as the gentleman pointed out, less than an hour ago in an arms national security markup meeting when I asked the chairman very directly, "Mr. Chairman, have you at all been briefed on what is going on"; he said, "No, I will be coming out with a statement and a letter shortly, today or tomorrow, expressing my concern on this issue."

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about American kids. We are not talking about some far-off. We are talking about our kids that are now being put on alert status to be sent over into a hostile environment where we know this madman is out to get them, and if this President wants us to get behind him, then he better make that case to us.

We will support the troops, no doubt about that. The question is, will we support the President, and that remains to be seen based upon what the plan is. None of us know what the plan is. We read about it every day and not only hear about it from the news announcement by a man named McCurry. He is not the President of the United States, and he is not charged with the responsibility of briefing us.

HURRICANE FRAN

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not object, I do not know what happened earlier where 1 minute was cut off for the Members of the minority. I was a minority Member for 18 years. I just think 1 minute and 5 minutes, and 60 minutes can go on all night, and I did not vote for that midnight cutoff. But I just wondered if we have a long series of 5 minutes who were not recorded or requesting a 5-minute speech today so I know how much time I have before my special order, because I am the first with a 60-minute special order today.